1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	DANIEL W. RANNELS,	Case No. 1:21-cv-00049-KES-SKO (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO GRANT
13	V.	DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
14	SMITH, et al.,	Docs. 52, 60
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff Daniel W. Rannels is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights action	
18	brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate	
19	Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
20	On January 27, 2025, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations	
21	recommending defendants' motion for summary judgment be granted. Doc. 60. The findings and	
22	recommendations concluded that defendants had submitted competent evidence showing that	
23	plaintiff failed to exhaust his available administrative remedies and that plaintiff had failed to	
24	rebut defendants' evidence. See id. The parties were directed to file any objections within 14	
25	days. Id. at 21. On February 11, 2025, plaintiff filed objections. Doc. 61.	
26	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Court has conducted a de	
27	novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the file, including plaintiff's objections, the	
28	Court concludes that the findings and recommend	mendations to be supported by the record and proper
	1	

Case 1:21-cv-00049-KES-SKO Document 64 Filed 07/24/25 Page 1 of 3

Case 1:21-cv-00049-KES-SKO $\,$ Document 64 $\,$ Filed 07/24/25 $\,$ Page 2 of 3 $\,$

analysis.

In his objections, plaintiff argues for the first time that he exhausted his administrative remedies. *See* Doc. 61 at 2–5. However, he does not specifically address the evidence that he either failed to fully appeal administratively most of the grievances identified in the findings and recommendations, or that, to the extent he appealed a grievance, it did not concern the claims at issue in this action and did not refer to the defendants. *See id.* Plaintiff's failure to address the contents and nature of any grievance he filed concerning his claims warrants adopting the findings and recommendations in full.

Even if that were not the case, however, plaintiff does not provide any competent evidence to support his assertions, and his objections are not signed under penalty of perjury.

Schroeder v. McDonald, 55 F.3d 454, 460 n.10 (9th Cir. 1995) (pleading counts as "verified" only if drafter states under penalty of perjury that contents are true and correct); cf. Jones v.

Blanas, 393 F.3d 918, 935 (9th Cir. 2004) (finding that, because plaintiff was proceeding pro se and concluded his objections to magistrate judge's findings with signed statement attesting under penalty of perjury to their truth, plaintiff's explanations qualified as evidence for purpose of opposing summary judgment motion). Plaintiff's vague and unverified assertions are insufficient to create a genuine dispute of material fact. See Lear v. Navarro, No. 1:21-CV-00600-KES-BAM (PC), 2024 WL 3968390, at *6 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 28, 2024) (rejecting argument that plaintiff's failure to exhaust should be excused, as plaintiff failed to provide any supporting evidence beyond his own vague assertions that he mailed an appeal for final level of review that went unanswered); Rivera v. AMTRAK, 331 F.3d 1074, 1078 (9th Cir. 2003) ("Conclusory allegations unsupported by factual data cannot defeat summary judgment."). Plaintiff's remaining objections fail to address the substance of the findings and recommendations. See Doc. 61.

Accordingly, defendants are entitled to summary judgment.

25 ///

26 ///

¹ The proof of service appended to the objections is signed under penalty of perjury, but the objections themselves are not. *See* Doc. 61 at 4, 5.

	Case 1:21-cv-00049-KES-SKO Document 64 Filed 07/24/25 Page 3 of 3	
1	Based upon the foregoing,	
2	1. The findings and recommendations issued on January 27, 2025, Doc. 60, are	
3	ADOPTED in full;	
4	2. Defendants' motion for summary judgment, Doc. 52, is GRANTED; and	
5	3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to enter judgment in defendants' favor, to terminate	
6	any deadlines, and to close this case.	
7		
8		
9	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
10	Dated: July 23, 2025	
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		